DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 380 014 HE 028 129

AUTHOR Ecker, Martha
TITLE Using Program Reviews for the Evaluation of Pedagogy.
PUB DATE Nov 94
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Conference on Current Collegiate Faculty Evaluation Practices and Procedures of the Center for Educational Development and Assessment (San Juan, PR, November 7-8, 1994).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; *College Instruction; Content Analysis; Course Descriptions; Ethnography; Evaluation Methods; Faculty College Relationship; Faculty Development; *Faculty Evaluation; Higher Education; Peer Evaluation; *Program Evaluation; *Reflective Teaching; *Self Evaluation (Individuals); Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Ramapo College of New Jersey

ABSTRACT

Ramapo College of New Jersey has implemented a program review with self-reflective pedagogy as a critical component. The review is a self-study that encourages faculty to use peer observation to evaluate and improve their pedagogy. The review encourages all faculty regardless of rank to serve as both observers and the observed in a series of visits. The review also encourages: various types of in-class assessment; content analysis of syllabi; evaluation of the stage of curriculum transformation as indicated by syllabi; and ethnographic exercises, such as analyzing physical arrangement of classrooms and faculty movements within classrooms. Faculty are asked to reflect on their modes of pedagogy and to make connections between form and content in presentation of course materials. Though faculty have been skeptical of the self-study, making pedagogy its central feature can underscore the value the institution places on teaching and learning. Appendixes contain an observer checklist and the syllabus from a social issues course used as an example in discussing the content analysis procedure. (Contains 15 references.) (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 380 014

Draft for Presentation Purposes Only
Do not cite without permission of author

Using Program Reviews for the Evaluation of Pedagogy

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Martha Ecker

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

HE 028 129

Martha Ecker
Director of Academic Programs
Associate Professor of Sociology
Ramapo College of New Jersey
505 Ramapo Valley Road
Mahwah, New Jersey 07430
201-529-7532

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Using Program Reviews for the Evaluation of Pedagogy

The State of New Jersey (prior to the demise of the Department of Higher Education in July, 1994) mandated a five year review of the major at each of the four year colleges within its jurisdiction. With the advent of a new Vice President for Academic Affairs at Ramapo in July of 1993, the Director of Academic Programs and Standards was asked to revise the guidelines for program review. After examining a number of documents published by the Association of American Colleges, it was agreed that the following statement that "... the goal of a program review should be to increase the self-consciousness of faculty members and administrators about their educational practices so they can improve the quality of teaching and learning " (Association of American Colleges, 1992; 14) be a guiding principle for the development of new procedures and policies.

Heretofore the program review did not necessarily address pedagogical issues. Discussions of student evaluations and alumni surveys were gneerally the context within which teaching and students were described and analyzed. We are, therefore, at the beginning of a process whereby the program review will be rewritten and self reflective pedagogy become a critical component.

Connected Learning

The Association of American Colleges proposes that the concept of connected learning be central to assessment.

> There are two ways, by no means unrelated, in which the term "connected learning" may be employed. The first refers to the capacity for constructing relationship among various modes of knowledge and curricular experiences, the capacity for applying learning from one context to another. The second refers to the capacity for relating academic learning to the wider world, to public issues and personal experience. In either case, connected learning means generalized learning: learning that extends beyond the necessary boundaries of any major and take seriously its potential translation beyond the limits of a course or program. (Association of American Colleges, 1991 p. 14).

Attempts to refine and redefine assessment also reconsider and expand "connected learning." The National Women's Studies Association in a FIPSE funded grant, co-sponsored by the Association of American Colleges discussed the concept of pedagogy. "Learner outcomes cannot be separated from teacher pedagogy." Connected learning is also defined as the interactive relationship between instructor and student. The concept of connected learning is also central to the revised guidelines for the self-study. Faculty are encouraged to use pper observation as one means of evaluating and improving pedagogy.

Peer Observations

While untenured faculty are regularly reviewed by colleagues, senior faculty are not. We encourage <u>all</u> faculty to serve as both the observed and the observer. The guidelines for the five year review include a one page checklist entitled "Looking for Good Teaching: A Guide for Observers." As you can see (transparency) a myriad of items are included. The checklist was originally developed in 1976 by the Danforth Faculty Felowship Project. Issues of gender, race/ethnicity, class, disability and age are clearly absent from the observer's checklist. We have, therefore, amended this list to include awareness of and sensitivity to diversity in the classroom. Faculty are encouraged to select several items under each of the two major categories: teaching through presentation and teaching

through involvement. Within each of these are several subcategories from which several items can be chosen.

We encourage each convening group (explain) to amend the checklist for the themselves and remind them that both the form and content of instruction must be responsive to various modes of inquiry.

In addition we emphasize the formative nature of the peer observation. There is a difference between peer evaluations upon which personnel decisions (summative evaluations) are made and peer evaluations which have as pedagogical improvement as an objective (formative evaluations) (Weimer et al. 1988, 286-287; Cohen, 1989, 6-8). While some evaluation experts believe that these can be confluent (cf. Willis 1989) many do not.We encourage a series of visits, rather than a one-time encounter in order to avoid a variety of problems (cf. Weimer et al. 1988).

In-Class Assessment

Many faculty are aware of a number of in-class assessment techniques currently being discussed. In the context of the five year review, we ask faculty to discuss the results of in-class assessment techniques. For example, one that is commonly used is simply to ask students at the end of the class to write two or three sentences about the most important points made during the course of that session. The instructor thereby discovers what students have (or have not) understood as salient.

Most faculty interested in pedagogy (which happily describes many people at Ramapo) do various forms of in-class assessment; oftentimes without realizing that that is what they are doing. The new five year review guidelines will provide examples of existent instruments for in-class assessment. These include: goals survey; confidence surveys; the summary statements discussed (above); time logs (for an excellent and

detailed discussion of all of these see Angelo and Cross, 1993).

Content Analyses

In the past, exams and syllabi were appended, often without notation, to the self-study document. In the five year review guidelines there is a section which details ways in which both qualitative and quantitative content analyses can be used to improve written communication(s) with students. "Content analysis is essentially a coding operation. Communications-oral,written, or other are coded or classified according to some conceptual framework (Babbie, 271). I have incorporated an exercise to help you to understand the way in which such an analysis might be accomplished. The syllabus you see in front of you (get it on a transparency) is the one I use in a course entitled, "Social Issues." It is a general education core course and is required of all first time full time students in the college and all students in the School of Social Science and Human Services (where I normally reside). Transfer students majoring in other schools are not required to take this course. That raises some important issues and problems which are not really germaine to this discussion.

I provide faculty with the following coding mechanism. They are free to devise their own methods and to provide aggregated results. As I go through the syllabus, I will code it and explain how to analyze the resulting data.

Variable I	Number of Pages	Columns 1-2
Variable II	Date	Columns 4-6
Variables III-VI	Mission	
Variable III	International	Column 7
Variable IV	Multicultural	Column 9
Variable V	Interdisciplinary	Column 11
Variable VI	Experiential	Column 12
Variable VII	Objectives	Column 13
Variable VIII	Assignments	Column 14
Variable IX	Grading Policy	Column 15

Variable X Other Column 16

Variable I simply requires the faculty member to count and record the number of pages. Variable II is the date given on the syllabus. If no date is recorded, a code of 999 is used. If a date is given a leading zero is followed by the year indicated. Variables three through six refer to whether or not the course content relates to the mission of the college. Ramapo College has four planks in its mission statement. Faculty are asked to record the degree to which the syllabus reflect the curricular commitment to internationalism, multiculturalism, interdisciplinarity and experiential learning. Each of these variables is coding in the following manner using a Likert type scale: 1=very much; 2=somewhat; 3=not at all; 9=cannot judge.

The next set of variables refer to the clarity with which course objectives, assignments and grading policy are explained. A similar scale is used in the coding of these variables: 1=very clear; 2=somewhat clear; 3=not at all clear. The last variable may be used to convey a qualitative or open ended response to the syllabus. Of course, faculty may (and will be encouraged to) create their own set of variables and devise an appropriate coding scheme.

Content analysis is used here for formative (not summative) evaluation purposes and therefore faculty are encouraged to aggregate the results of their analysis. This analysis should alert faculty to where there are serious weaknesses in the curriculum and not to idiosyncratic problems which may arise in any given semester.

Obviously, the choice of categories and codes is contingent upon the how the curriculum is conceived and offered and the disciplines or interdisciplinary cluster(s) involved. One would expect, for example, the

Social Issues course to more obviously relate to the mission platform than the statistics and/or research methods courses I regularly teach. Since many accrediting agencies (such as CSWE and Middle States) are examining the curriculum in an effort to gauge the extent to which it is infused with the concepts of gender, race/ethnicity, class and attention to ageism and ability/disability, the kind of content analysis described above is invaluable for providing a gross overview of the curriculum.

Should there be some interest in creating a more elaborate mechanism for measuring the degree to which the curriculum is infused with the multicultural/international content, a more sophisticated coding scheme can be applied. Using the models created by McIntosh (1983) and Schuster and Van Dyne (1984) upon which more recent work is based, I created a set of variables which allows the evaluator to determine the stage of curriculum transformation. The following is a somewhat simplistic description of the "stages of curriculum change" detailed by Schuster and Van Dyne. For each of the relevant infusion items, one can examine a course outline and use it as an indicator of the stage of curriculum change. Once the data is gathered, aggregated and analyzed, the faculty should be able to see where they are and discuss where they would like to be. I will briefly discuss each stage of curriculum change using the Schuster/VanDyne model which I think is both easy to use and conceptually sophisticated. There are several ways in which a coding scheme could be constructed using their paradigm. The easiest scheme is one in which the coder looks over the entire syllabus/course outline and places it in one of the six stages discussed, or in a seventh category which is defined as missing or unknown. For faculty coders familiar with infusion objectives, such a process may be relatively simple. For those faculty who are unacquainted with the process

and/or the literature, this may prove more daunting.

Let me go through each phase and point out obvious indicators which can be used as variables themselves or simply as one among many signifiers of the stage at which the course is located. While Schuster and Van Dyne's model is specifically structured to analyze gender categories; it can also be utilized (with some modification) to include race/ethnicity, class and a number of other variables.

Stage 1 is where the "...absence women is not noted (Schuster and Van Dyne, 1985; 419). It is where we locate the existant canon or the unmodified curriculum. Stage 2 entitled, "the search for missing women," includes courses in which the outline or syllabus is largely unchanged from stage 1. The difference here is that exceptional women (or latinos or chicanas or african american men etc.) are added on. In the third stage women appear in the course as "disadvantaged and/or members of a subordinate group." Courses of this type tend to view those in the subaltern position as "victims." Such individuals and groups do not yet appear in intellectual life as active, historical subjects. The fourth stage is characterized by a somewhat different attention to gender. In this stage "women are studied on their own terms." There is an attempt to understand women's experiences and to begin to distinguish among different types of women. Stage 5 is a seminal one. This stage is labelled "women as a challenge to the discipline." It is at this point in curriculum transformation that faculty realize that the existant paradigms because of their neglect of various groups both methodologically and substantively must be altered. (Give examples from research methods-- the problem of sampling and survey research. The issue of various forms of validity and their relation to sampling and sample size). Finally, in the last stage,

"transformed, balanced curriculum," the syllabus/course outline reflects an attempt to introduce and grapple with new models and methods of inquiry. The additional variable, Variable XI, indicates the stage of curriculum transformation as indicated by the syllabus. The codes correspond to the levels just described with a code of nine designating a missing syllabus or one in which it is impossible to code. Aggregating results provides faculty in a particular discipline, major or minor with an indication of how effectively they have infused the course outline with attention to gender etc. Computers and related technology have changed the form and content of assessment.

Ethnography and the Classroom

Classroom ethnographic research has benefitted from the video recorder. In *Coming of Age in New Jersey*, Michael Moffatt, an anthropologist who lived among students at Rutgers University in the late 1970s and middle 1980s, provides a hard copy ethnographic account of college life from the perspective of residential students. I used this book in the "Social Issues" course with much success over the course of several semesters. What was most compelling to me about Moffatt's findings was how relatively unimportant the classroom experience was for a majority of the students with whom he interacted. As a faculty member, I was completely astounded to discover that the classroom was not nearly as important to my students as it was to me. (Of course now that I am an administrator I understand this and have several theoretical models with which to explain it).

Nonetheless, as it is our purpose to improve pedagogy, it is useful to engage in a number of ethnographic exercises which may be used to improve teaching and learning. One of the more useful exercises is that in which

the faculty member looks at and aanalyzes the spatial arrangements of the classroom. Instructors can analyze the kinesics of themselves as well as those of students within the classroom environment. For example, the much maligned "back of the room" students may not always be the least engaged, but may for a variety of reasons find that to be the most comfortable space. A discussion of the implications of who sits where and with whom may be just as important for students as for faculty.

Faculty can look at their own movements within the classroom. Many instructors have videotaped their classes in order to facilitate this sort of analysis. For example each instructor can pay attention to whether they stand in front of or behind a desk or lectern, whether or not they make eye contact with students, how they are poised when listening to students' questions. etc. Given the large numbers of students at Ramapo with physical disabilities, awareness of body and movement is even more critical.

Modes of Pedagogy

In a recent program review, faculty discussed a number of methods for presenting course materials. Because the mode of presentation is obviously related to course content, this is a critical part of the report. Many faculty replicate the presentation style with which they are most familiar, i.e. most likely they teach the way they were taught. Styles are often not as responsive to characteristics of the audience and nature of presented materials as they ought to be. By asking the faculty to reflect on the ways in which they instruct their students, we are actually asking them to do several things, among these are: to consider alternative modes of instruction; to think about the types of students they are currently teaching; to consider what they themselves mean be effective teaching and

finally to reinforce the connection between teaching and learning; themselves and their students.

Where several modes of presentation are available, faculty may use this reflexive moment to think about the obvious connections between form(s) and content(s). The management faculty included several pedagogical techniques in their self-study and the types of learning and classroom interaction implicit in each (see APPENDIX 1).

Conclusions

Faculty are typically skeptical of both the validity and legitimacy of the self-study, often with good reason. The notion that administrators are actually interested in high quality teaching is often belied by the manner in which institutions tend to reward and characterize faculty.

Making pedagogy the linch pin of the self study underscores the value the institution places on teaching and learning. Using some of the techniques cited above, faculty can describe, assess and revamp their curricular and pedagogical plans. Rewarding good teaching and recognizing contributions to effective pedagogy as a legitimate form of scholarship can help to alter the cynicism with which such programs are often viewed.

Appendix A

Looking for Good Teaching: A Guide for Observers*

This observation guide is intended to assist an observer in watching for certain kinds of behavior in order to help the teacher build on strengths. It provides information for the teacher which is specific so that s/he receives some concrete information, selective so that s/he gets some guidance as to appropriate directions for change, and positive so that s/he gets some encouragement. The observer records actual examples to enable the teacher to use her/his own best practice as the standard to work toward. The information that comes from the checklist is intended only for the information and use of the teacher, not for evaluation of her/his performance.

The 200 items on the complete checklist were drawn from 70 books and articles about good teaching and each represents a description of recommended classroom practice. Since there are many kinds of good teaching there are a wide variety of behaviors listed including some which are contradictory, the choice depending on what the teacher is trying to do. The items themselves may become a source of ideas for the teacher, suggesting new or alternative teaching practice.

Below are selected sample items dealing with lecture and discussion formats. There is also an additional set of items relating to the use of questions in the classroom.

TEACHING THROUGH PRESENTATION

Mechanics

__Moves about room
__Varies activities over class period
__Uses illustrative materials or teaching aids
__Sensitive to response of class
__Paces delivery to students' capacity to follow
__Notices questions, volunteers

Scholarship

__Indicates how knowledge is obtained
__Shows relation of theory to practice
__Presents facts or concepts from related fields or relates topics to other areas of knowledge

TEACHING THROUGH INVOLVEMENT

Preparation and Conclusion

__Has provided for input-reading, TV or film viewing, observation, etc.-prior to discussion
__States objectives
__Lets students know what will be expected of them in terms of participation
__Involves students in deciding what issues to discuss
__Draws together contributions of various members of the group

__Summarizes and draws new conceptualizations at end

Involving students

__Uses questions to stimulate discussion

__Refers to recent developments in the field

Organization

Opening

__Focuses student attention (by demonstration, activity, question, etc.) before launching into lecture

__States goals or objectives for class session

Structure

__Presents material in several short blocks

__Summarizes periodically

__Refers back to points made or terms used earlier

Closing

__Summarizes major points or sees that class does so

__Makes an assignment or suggests an activity which builds on day's topics, something to do or think about

Classroom relationships

__Appears interested and enthusiastic

__Relates goals and content to social context, course or personal goals

__Prompts awareness of students' relevant knowledge or experience (gives or asks for examples, refers to prior learning, etc.)

__Uses humor

__Admits s/he doesn't know or is wrong

__Talks about why s/he does what s/he does in class

__Accepts student ideas and comments (by reflecting, clarifying, summarizing, encouraging, or praising)

__Provides opportunities for and encourages audience participation and questions

__Calls for questions in a way that does not embarrass or belittle

__Prevents or terminates discussion monopolies

__Recognizes potential contributor and makes an opening for that person

__Reinforces infrequent contributor

__Assists a quiet student in "saying what s/he means"

Quality of interaction

__Listens

__Reminds students to listen to one another

__When discussion is not going well, stops to deal directly with group processes

__Helps student to accept correction or appropriate criticism

__Encourages students to acknowledge comments of others by summarizing them

__Allows time for evaluation of the discussion itself

__When necessary to intervene, does so briefly

Quality and content of discussion

__Introduces relevant considerations that have been missed

__Questions misconceptions, faulty logic, unwarranted conclusions

__Distinguishes a value from a fact

__Requires student to defend his/her position, relate it to other ideas, or modify it

__Points out areas of confusion

__Intervenes when discussion gets off the track

__Uses questions to guide discussion

__Summarizes discussion periodically

__Encourages expression of differences of opinion

__Supports the rights of speakers who hold minority or unpopular views

__Refrains from introducing her/his

the questioner
__Allows time for formulation of questions
__Checks to see if answer has been understood
__Helps student answer his/her own question
own opinion to avoid biasing discussion
__Presents her/his own opinion to enhance seriousness of discussion

A complete copy of the checklist may be obtained from :

Dr. Barbara S. Helling
Teaching/Learning Center
St. Olaf College
Northfield, MN 55057

From a Danforth Faculty Fellowship Project Report, "LOOKING FOR GOOD TEACHING: A GUIDE TO PEER OBSERVATION" (1976)

*Diversity**

___What was the gender and race/ethnicity composition of this class?

___Were you comfortable sitting in the class?

___What is your gender?

___What is your race/ethnicity

___Do you feel that the experiences of suboridinated groups were well represented in this course?

___Were issues of gender and/or race and ethnicity addressed in readings?

___Were issues of gender and/or race and ethncity addressed on exams.

___Were prevailing paradigms regarding world view or perspective addressed on the course outline and/or in the class session?

Appendix B

Diversity

What was the gender and race/ethnic composition of the class?

_____

_____Were issues of gender and race/ethnicity addressed in the readings?

_____Were issues of gender and race/ethnicity addressed on assignments and/or examinations?

_____Were prevailing paradigms, perspectives and/or models discussed in the course?

_____Was the new scholarship on race/ethnicity and gender integrated into the curriculum?

_____Were all students made to feel comfortable.

_____Were all students heard?

_____Were all students encouraged to express their ideas?

Appendix C

Spring, 1993
Office Hours: Monday and Thursday: 9:30-11:00 A.M.
and by appointment

SOCIAL ISSUES

Course Outline

This course is an introduction to the social sciences with a particular focus on class, gender, race and ethnicity. We will consider how these social characteristics affect and are affected by history, the economy and social relations.
During the semester we will examine three sor. M. Eckercial issues in detail: immigration: education and popular culture.
This course will emphasize student participation and writing. Students will present and hand in a family history (details appended). Oral reports on education and popular culture will be expected. In addition, there will be four short answer quizzes or exercises and an essay type midterm and final examination.

Students are expected to do all required readings prior to the class meeting and to come to class prepared to participate in discussions.
Attendance will be taken. After three (3) absences, students will be required to set up a conference with me to discuss make-up work and/or withdrawal from the course.
Required Books:

Ronald Takaki, From Distant Shores:Perspectives on Race and Ethnicity in the United States.

Paula Rothenberg, Race, Class and Gender in the U.S.
ONE of the following:
Jay MacLeod, Ain't No Makin'It.
Michael Moffatt, Coming of Age in New Jersey.
ONE of the following:
Stuart Ewen, Captains of Consciousness.
Simon Frith, Sound Effects.
Janice Radway, Reading the Romance.
E. Ann Kaplan, Rockin' Round the Clock.

Additional readings will be handed out in class.

Requirements:

Participation	10% of final grade
Family History	15% of final grade
Oral Reports	15% of final grade
Four Quizzes	25% of final grade
Midterm Examination	15% of final grade
Final Examination	20% of final grade

January 21 Introduction
The place of 'Social Issues' in the curriculum

25 Science and the Social Sciences
Read: Kenneth Hoover, "Thinking Scientifically," from The Elements of Social Scientific Thinking.handout

28 Values, Objectivity, Subjectivity and Science

Read :Robert Nisbet, "Subjective Si! Objective No!" in Riley ed. Values, Objectivity and the Social Sciences. handout

February 1 Race. Ethnicity and the Culture of the U.S. Read: Nathan Glazer. "The Emergence of an American Ethnic Pattern." and Ronald Takaki. "Reflections on Racial Patterns in America." in Takaki. pp. 13-37.

FIRST QUIZ

4 Immigration
Read: John Higham, "Strangers in the Land: Nativism and Nationalism." and Maxine Seller. "Beyond the Stereotype: A New Look at Immigrant Women." in Takaki.

8 & 11 Race and Ethnicity: The "Other"
Read: Rothenberg pp. 36-45; 63-78; 258-265; 287-291. Read: Winthrop Jordan. "First Impressions: Libidinous Blacks" in Takaki.

15 Film: "The Eye of the Storm"

18 Race and Ethnicity: Theoretical Considerations

Read: Rothenberg, pp. 26-36.
pp. Barbara Jean Fields, "Slavery, Race and Ideology in the United States," handout.
SECOND QUIZ

22 Family Histories
Oral Presentations and Discussions

25 Family Histories-
Oral Presentations and Discussions continued

March 1 Family Histories -concluded
Written Reports Due

4 Sex and Gender: Historical Background
Read: pp. 45-57: 192-201: 309-319 in Rothenberg; Phyllis Palmer. "White Women/Black Women: The Dualism of Feminine Identity and Experience, " ans Chalsa Loo amd Paul Ong, "Slaying demons with a Sewing Needle: Feminist Issues for Chinese Women." in Takaki .
Family Histories Due (written reports)

8 Sex and Gender: Theoretical Considerations Read: Suzanne Kessler and Wendy McKenna,"Gender and Sex," excerpt handout.

11 Midterm Examination

22 Social Class: The Hidden Dimension
Read: Clara Rodriguez, Puerto Ricans and the Political Economy of New York," and Edna Bonacich, "A Theory of Ethnic Antagonisms," in Takaki

25 Social Class: Theoretical and Contemporary Considerations
Read: pp. 91-141 in Rothenberg and excerpt from T.B. Bottomore, Classes in Contemporary Society.

29 Conference Day

April 1 Education
THIRD QUIZ

4 Education
Oral Reports on Ain't No Makin' It and Coming of Age in New Jersey.

8 Popular Culture
Read: Read: Rothenberg, 320-397.

12 & 15 Popular Culture
Oral Reports on Captains of Consciousness, Sound Effects, and Rockin' Round the Clock.

19 Analyzing Popular Culture: Music Videos
Please tape several music videos and bring them to class for this session
Read: Jane Brown and Laurie Schulze. "The Effects of Race, Gender and Fandom on Audience Interpretations of Madonna's Music Videos, Journal of Communications, 1990.
FOURTH QUIZ

22 Social Change
The Consequences of Inequality
Read: Lourdees King, "Puertorroquenas in the U.S.: The Impact of Double Discrimination." in Takaki.

26 Social Change
Civil Rights
Read: Rothenberg pp. 305-309; 250-258.
Film: "Eyes on the Prize"

29 & May 3 Some Solutions?
Read: Rothenberg, "Beyond Racism and Sexism."
(entire section) pp. 401-452.
Read: Takaki, pp. 221-250.

May 6 Conclusions and Review

Appendix D

Social Research with Computer Methods
Spring, 1993
Office Hours: Monday and Thursday: 9:30-11:00 A.M.,
and by appointment

COURSE OUTLINE

This course will examine social research methods. Through a series of exercises, computer programming labs and a research project, students will learn the components of the research process.

The following books are required for this course:
Select one of the following texts:
Social Science Majors: Earl Babbie, THE PRACTICE OF SOCIAL RESEARCH.

OR

Social Work Majors: Allen Rubin and Earl Babbie, RESEARCH METHODS FOR SOCIAL WORK.

Choose one of the following:
E. Liebow. TALLY'S CORNER.
J. McLeod. AIN'T NO MAKIN' IT.
M. Moffatt. COMING OF AGE IN NEW JERSEY.
J. Rollins. BETWEEN WOMEN: DOMESTICS AND THEIR EMPLOYERS.
I am recommending, but not requiring the following:

Requirements:

Exercises	20% of final grade
Examination #1	15% of final grade
Examination #2	15% of final grade
Examination #3	15% of final grade
Project	25% of final grade
Participation	10% of final grade

Five absenses will result in an automatic failure.
Late exercises will not be accepted.

January 21 Introduction
Science and Social Research
Recommended Readings:
Kuhn, Thomas. The Structure of Scientific Revolutions.
Harding, Sandra. The Science Question in Feminism.
Keller, Evelyn Fox. "Feminism and Science." Signs 7:589-602.

25 and 28 Values and the Research Process
Research Design
Read: Rubin and Babbie, Chapters 1-4.
Read: Babbie, Chapters 1-4.
Robert Nisbet, "Subjective Si! Objective No!" and Marvin Surkin, "Sense and Nonsense in Politics."

February 1 Computer Lab
First Exercise Due

4 Measurement and Research
Read: Rubin and Babbie Chapters 5-6.
Read: Babbie, Chapter 5.

8 Sampling
Read: Rubin and Babbie, Chapter 8.
Read: Babbie, Chapter 8.
Read: Cannon, Lynn Weber, Elizabeth Higginbotham and Marianne Leung. "Race and Class Bias in Qualitative Research on Women." in Gender and Society.

11 Survey Research
Read: Rubin and Babbie, Chapter 11 and 14.
Babbie, Chapter 6,10 and 14.
Omit sections on interviewing.

15 and 18 Describing Your Data: Frequency Distributions and
Measures of Central Tendency
Read: Rubin and Babbie, Chapter 15.
Read: Babbie, Chapter 15.

22 Examination #1

25 Interviewing
Read: Rubin and Babbie, Chapter 11.
Read: Babbie, Chapter 10.
Oakley, Ann. "Interviewing Women: A Contradiction in Terms." in Helen Roberts (ed.), Doing Feminist Research. pp. 30-61.
Read sections on interviewing in texts.

Second Exercise Due

March 1 Computer Lab

4 and 8 Experimental Design and Single Subject Design
Read: Babbie, Chapter 9.
Read: Rubin and Babbie, Chapter 9.
Levy and Olson, "The Single Subject Methodology in Practice," Journal of Social Service Research, 1979.

11 Indexes and Scales
Read: Rubin and Babbie, Chapter 7 (review):
Babbie, Chapter 7.

22 Computer Lab: Analysing your data
Rubin and Babbie, Appendix H or Babbie, Appendix G.

Third Exercise Due

25, 29 and April 1 Basic Statistics
Read: Rubin and Babbie, Chapter 15:
Babbie, Chapter 17.

April 5 Second examination

8 Content Analysis
Read: Rubin and Babbie, Chapter 13; Babbie, Chapter 12 and Dennis Lowry and David Towles, "Soap Opera Portrayals of Sex,

Contraception and Sexually Transmitted Diseases," Journal of Communications, Spring, 1989.

Recommended Readings:

Radway, Janice. Reading the Romance.

12 and 15 Evaluation Research

Read: Rubin and Babbie, Chapter 17; Babbie, Chapter 13.

Joan S. Velasquez and Charles G. Lyle, " Day versus Residential Treatment for Juvenile Offenders: The Impact of Program Evaluation," Child Welfare and Tolman and Bhosley, "A Comparison of Pregroup Preparation for Men Who Batter." Journal of Social Service Research, 1989. and

Fourth Exercise Due

19 Computer Lab

22 and 26 Observational Research

Read: Rubin and Babbie, Chapter 12.

Read: Babbie, Chapter 11.

Read: Ethnography

May 3 Computer Lab

6 Values, Ethics and Social Research: A Critique

Read: Rubin and Babbie, Chapter 3; Babbie, Chapter 18 and 19.

Read: Donna Haraway, "Situated Knowledges: The

Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege
of
Partial Perspective," handout.
Conclusions and Review

10 Final Examination

Exercise #1: Find ten articles in scholarly journals which relate to your topic. Construct an annotated bibliography.

Exercise #2: Construct three open ended and three closed ended questions which relate to your topic. Find ten respondents and have each person complete the questionnaire. Discuss the quality
of each question and summarize your results.

Exercise #3: Using the questionnaires (exercise #2) enter your data utilizing SPSSX. Construct frequency distributions for each variable.

Exercise #4: Using the data (exercise #3), perform two crosstabular analyses. Discuss your findings.

Each exercise should be 3-5 double spaced typed pages. After a
one week 'grace' period, exercises will be downgraded two points a day.

Final Project: The purpose of the final project is to demonstrate your ability to collect and analyze empirical data
using one or more of the data collection techniques discussed in class as well as SPSSX.
The paper should be a minimum of ten (10) and a maximum of twenty five (25) double spaced typed pages.
The following is a suggested format:

1. Statement of the problem/hypothesis

References

Anderson, Margaret L. "Changing the Curriculum in Higher Education, " *Signs* 12 (2) (Winter, 1987), 222-254.

Angelo, Thomas A. and K. Patricia Cross. *Classroom Assessment Techniques: A Handbook for College Teachers,* San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1993.

Aper, Jeffrey P. and Dennis E. Hinkle. "state Policies for Assessing Student Outcomes," *Journal of Higher Education*. 62 (5), (September/October, 1991), 539-555.

Association of American Colleges. *The Challenge of Connected Learning*. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1991.

Association of American Colleges, Project on the Status of Women. "Evaluating New Courses for Inclusion of New Scholarship on Women," Washington, D.C. Association of American Colleges, May, 1988.

Centra, John A. "The Use of the Teaching Portfolio and Student Evaluations for Summative Evaluation," *Journbal of Higher Education*. 65 (5), (September/October, 1994), 555-570.

Danforth Faculty Fellowship Project, "Looking for Good Teaching: A Guide to Peer Observation, Northfield, Minnesota, St. Olaf College, 1976.

McIntosh, Peggy. "Interactive Phases of Curricular Re-vision: A Feminist Perspective," Working Paper no. 124. MA: Wellesley, 1983.

Musil, Caryn McTighe (ed.). *Students at the Center: Feminist Assessment*. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges 1992.

Schuster, Marilyn and Susan Van Dyne. "Placing Women in the Liberal Arts: Stages of Curriculum Transformation," *Harvard Educational Review*. November, 1984, 54 (4), 413-428.

Scott, Robert A. "Goof Practice in Academic Management: The Review of Programs," *Chancellor's Report to the Board of Higher Education*. Department of Higher Education, State of New Jersey, September 1993, 10-13.

Storla, Steven R. "Peer Observation for Instructor Training and Program Development," Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, Boston, MA. March 21-23, 1991.

Weimer, Maryellen Gleason , Mary-Margaret Kerns and Joan L. Parrett, "Instructional Observation: caveats, concerns and ways to compensate," *Studies in Higher Education*. 13 (3) , 1988, 285-293.

Weston, Cynthia and Lynn McAlpine. "Improving Instruction Through Formative Evaluation." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association, New Orleans, April, 1994.

Wilson, Robert C. "Improving Faculty Teaching: Effective Use of Student Evaluations and Consultants," *Journal of Higher Education*. 57 (2) March/April, 1986, 196-211.